arXiv:1211.3919v2 [math.NT] 19 Nov 2012

FORMS IN MANY VARIABLES AND p-ADIC SOLUBILITY

JULIA BRANDES

Abstract. By adopting a new approach to the analysis of the density of p-adic solutions arising in applications of the circle method, we show that under modest conditions the existence of non-trivial p-adic solutions suffices to establish positivity of the singular series. This improves on earlier approaches due to Davenport, Schmidt and others, which require the existence of non-singular p-adic solutions. As a by-product, we obtain a version of Hensel's Lemma for linear spaces. Finally, we illustrate the strength of our new method with an investigation of rational linear spaces on the intersection of cubic hypersurfaces, establishing in particular that any system of R cubic forms has a common zero, provided only that $s \geq (13R)^4$.

1. Introduction

Thanks to the groundbreaking work of Davenport [5] and Birch [2] and later Schmidt [18], the treatment of forms in many variables is now one one of the most classical applications of the circle method. However, the generic outcome of the circle method being only a local-global principle, the transition to asymptotic estimates of the number of solutions depends on the additional condition that the local solutions are not only non-trivial but non-singular, and for this problem no fully satisfactory methods have been available so far. Indeed, while non-singular real solubility is harmless if the degree is odd (see [17, §2]), establishing comparable statements over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ is a far more delicate problem, and whilst it is not impossible to infer the existence of non-singular p-adic points from our knowledge about non-trivial p-adic solubility, the technical devices which are commonly applied in order to do so are complicated and wasteful. In this paper we address this problem and develop a more efficient geometric approach for making the transition from non-trivial to non-singular p-adic points at the cost of inflating the number of variables by no more than what is required by the geometry of the problem.

Let $H_d(R,m)$ be the least integer H such that for every non-singular system $\mathbf{F}$ of R forms of degree d in at least $s \geq H$ variables there exist nonnegative constants χ_∞ and χ_p for every prime p such that the number $N_{R,m}^{(d)}(P)$ of linear spaces of affine dimension m and height at most P contained in the complete intersection $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$ obeys the asymptotic formula

$$N_{R,m}^{(d)}(P) = P^{ms-Rrd}\chi_\infty \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \chi_p + o\left(P^{ms-Rrd}\right),$$

where the parameter r is given by

$$r = \binom{d-1+m}{d}. \tag{1.1}$$

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11D72 (11E76, 11P55, 11D88).

Key words and phrases: Hensel's Lemma, forms in many variables, systems of cubic forms.

Partially supported by EPSRC.

Then Birch's theorem [2] and its multidimensional generalisation [3, Theorem 1] provide the upper bound

$$H_d(R,m) \leq 2^{d-1}\tau_m(d-1)R(Rr+1), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\tau_1 = 1$ and $\tau_m = 3$ if $m \geq 2$. Similarly, let $\gamma_d^p(R,m)$ denote the least integer γ such that any system of R forms of degree d in $s \geq \gamma$ variables contains a p-adic linear space of affine dimension m. These are bounded above, so we can safely define

$$\gamma_d^*(R,m) = \sup_{p \text{ prime}} \gamma_d^p(R,m)$$

to be the least number of variables for which there are no p-adic obstructions to the solubility of the linear spaces problem.

Furthermore, we follow Birch [2] in defining the singular locus of the $F^{(\rho)}$ as

$$\mathfrak{S} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} : \operatorname{rank}(\partial_i F^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x})) \leq R-1 \right\}.$$

It should be pointed out at this stage that, while Birch [2] seems to define his locus of singularities over $\mathbb{R}$, most of our discussion involves the fields $\mathbb{Q}_p$ of p-adic numbers. However, in either case the dimension is bounded above by the dimension of the singular locus over the algebraically closed fields $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ resp. $\mathbb{C}$, so this presents a well-defined upper bound. Our main theorem is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $\mathbf{F} = (F^{(1)}, \ldots, F^{(R)})$ *be forms of degree* d*, where* d *is odd. Furthermore, suppose that*

$$s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > \max\left\{H_d(R,m), \gamma_d^*(R,m)\right\}$$

where r *is as defined in* (1.1) *and the singular locus is viewed over an algebraically closed field. Then we have*

$$N_{R,m}^{(d)}(P) = P^{ms-Rrd}\chi_\infty \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \chi_p + o\left(P^{ms-Rrd}\right), \tag{1.3}$$

and the product of the local densities $\chi_\infty \prod_p \chi_p$ *is positive.*

Notice that the bound $s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > H_d(R,m)$ is just the condition in Birch's theorem in [2] and [3], respectively, and the real solution density is positive for odd degree, so the significance of Theorem 1.1 lies in the implied bound $s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > \gamma_d^*(R,m)$ for non-singular p-adic solubility. This bound clearly supersedes the previous treatment of the case $m = 1$ due to Schmidt (see the first supplement and the discussion after the proof of Lemma 2 in [17]), which requires

$$s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > 2^{d-1}(d-1)R\gamma_d^*(R,1) \tag{1.4}$$

in order to ensure that the p-adic densities be positive. In contrast, the bound in Theorem 1.1 is much simpler, such as one would naïvely expect, and indeed the effect of our new result is that, from a philosophical point of view and as far as p-adic solubility is concerned, the non-diagonal problem is now on an equal footing with Waring-type situations.

As for numeric values, recall that for $H_d(R,m)$ we have the bound (1.2), whereas [20, Theorem 2.4] implies that

$$\gamma_d^*(R,m) \leq (R^2d^2 + mR)^{2^{d-2}} d^{2^{d-1}}.$$

Thus Theorem 1.1 implies that for odd d we have asymptotic behaviour as soon as

$$s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > \max\left\{ 2^{d-1}\tau_m(d-1)R(Rr+1), (R^2d^2+mR)^{2^{d-2}} d^{2^{d-1}} \right\}.$$

Notice that the second term will in most cases dominate, yielding to the first only for some values of m and R if $d = 3$.

As in [3], for small degrees d we can get rid of the non-singularity condition at the expense of increasing the bounds on s. Let $\gamma_d(R,m)$ denote the smallest number γ such that any intersection of R hypersurfaces of degree d in $s \geq \gamma$ variables contains a m-dimensional rational linear space. We remark here that the dimension m of the linear space is understood in the affine sense, so one-dimensional linear spaces are really just projective points, and in this case one has the long-standing bound $\gamma_3(R,1) \leq (10R)^5$ obtained by Schmidt [17]. There have been various attempts for improvement on the constant, usually at the cost of either having to make further assumptions regarding the p-adic solubility or settling for higher growth rates in R (see [9, Theorem 1], [13, p.546] and [20, Lemma 3.1] for instance), but as yet nobody seems to have succeeded in obtaining anything below quintic growth rates in R.

Theorem 1.2. *We have*

$$\gamma_3(R,1) \leq 11925R(R+1)^3.$$

This is the first time that quartic growth in R has been attained for these quantities. Notice that for $R \leq 2$ one has the bounds of $\gamma_3(1,1) \leq 14$ and $\gamma_3(2,1) \leq 827$ due to Heath-Brown [12, Thm 1] and Dietmann and Wooley [8, Thm 4], respectively, and for $R \geq 3$ the bound in Theorem 1.2 can be simplified to give the bound stated in the abstract. The main reason that made this improvement possible is the fact that previous authors pursued the strategy of trying to gain better control on $\gamma_d^*(R,1)$ for cubic forms, whereas our improvement stems from the fact that Theorem 1.1 allows us a more efficient use of existing bounds, and in fact saves one power of R over previous results.

For general m this problem has first been successfully attempted by Lewis and Schulze-Pillot [14, p. 282], who proved

$$\gamma_3(R,m) \ll R^{11}m + R^3m^5,$$

a result that has been supplemented by Schmidt's (see [14, p. 283]) bound of

$$\gamma_3(R,m) \ll R^5m^{14}. \tag{1.5}$$

Later results include Dietmann's bound of $\gamma_3(R,m) \ll R^6m^4 + R^5m^6$ [9, Theorem 2], and recently Brandes [3, Theorem 3] succeeded to establish $\gamma_3(R,m) \ll R^6 + R^3m^3$, thus supplanting all previous bounds but that of Schmidt (1.5), which prevails for $m \gg R^{1/14}$. With the help of Theorem 1.1 we are now able to derive improved estimates which supersede all of the above.

Theorem 1.3. *We have*

$$\gamma_3(R,m) \ll \min\left\{R^4m^{11}, R^5 + R^3m^3\right\},$$

and the constant can be made explicit.

Again, this saves roughly one power of R over previous results, and as before, this saving can be traced back to the factor of R that Theorem 1.1 gains over older approaches. Note that in the case $R = 1$ different methods [8, Thm 2] yield

$$\gamma_3(1,m) \leq \frac{1}{2}(5m^2 + 33m + 32),$$

which beats the bounds we are able to obtain in the respective case even for small values of m.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude towards my supervisor Trevor Wooley, without whose keen insight and constant encouragement this work would not have been possible, and towards Tim Dokchitser for many helpful discussions about algebraic geometry.

2. Hensel's Lemma for linear spaces

A crucial stepping stone in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a suitable version of Hensel's Lemma, adapted for linear space situations. As is usual with arguments in the spirit of Hensel's Lemma, this involves finding a non-singular approximate solution which can then be lifted to higher moduli and ultimately generate solutions in $\mathbb{Q}_p$. It is, however, not obvious what shape the non-singularity condition takes in our case, as the multi-dimensional situation has a higher degree of intrinsic complexity than the one-dimensional setting. This makes it necessary to spend some time specifying what it means for a solution to be non-singular.

In order to count linear spaces contained in the hypersurface defined by $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$, one needs to understand expressions of the shape

$$F^{(\rho)}(t_1\mathbf{x}_1 + \ldots + t_m\mathbf{x}_m) = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Suppose the forms $F^{(1)}, \ldots, F^{(R)} \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_s]$ are given by

$$F^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \{1,\ldots,s\}^d} c^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{i}) x_{i_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot x_{i_d}$$

with symmetric coefficients $c^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{i}) \in \mathbb{Z}/d!$. Then we can define the multilinear forms $\Phi^{(\rho)}$ associated to $F^{(\rho)}$ as

$$\Phi^{(\rho)}\left(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^{(d)}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \{1,\ldots,s\}^d} c^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{i}) x^{(1)}_{i_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot x^{(d)}_{i_d},$$

such that

$$F^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}).$$

Write J for the set of multi-indices

$$J = \{(j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_d) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}^d : j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \ldots \leq j_d\}.$$

The number of these is

$$\mathrm{Card}(J) = r,$$

which is the parameter defined in (1.1). By means of the Binomial Theorem, (2.1) can be written as

$$F^{(\rho)}\left(t_1\mathbf{x}_1 + \ldots + t_m\mathbf{x}_m\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in J} A(\mathbf{j}) t_{j_1} t_{j_2} \ldots t_{j_d} \Phi^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \mathbf{x}_{j_2}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{j_d}), \tag{2.2}$$

with suitable integral factors $A(\mathbf{j})$ that take account of the multiplicity of each term.

For the sake of brevity and compactness, we will introduce the shorthand notation

$$(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_m) = \overline{\mathbf{x}}$$

and

$$d!\Phi^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \ldots \mathbf{x}_{j_d}) = \Phi^{(\rho)}_{\mathbf{j}}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}).$$

This way, every linear space corresponds to a solution to the system of equations

$$\Phi^{(\rho)}_{\mathbf{j}}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{j} \in J,\ 1 \leq \rho \leq R, \tag{2.3}$$

and the forms $\Phi^{(\rho)}_{\mathbf{j}}$ have integral coefficients. Furthermore, let $\Gamma_{R,m}(p^l)$ denote the number of solutions $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_m \in \mathbb{Z}/p^l\mathbb{Z}$ of the simultaneous congruences

$$F^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}_1 t_1 + \ldots + \mathbf{x}_m t_m) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^h}, \quad 1 \leq \rho \leq R,$$

identically in $t_1, \ldots, t_m$, then by (2.2) this can be written as

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^l) = \mathrm{Card}\left\{\overline{\mathbf{a}} \in (\mathbb{Z}/p^l\mathbb{Z})^{ms} : \Phi^{(\rho)}_{\mathbf{j}}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^l} \text{ for all } \mathbf{j} \in J, 1 \leq \rho \leq R\right\}. \tag{2.4}$$

Suppose $\overline{\mathbf{a}} \in (\mathbb{Z}_p)^{ms}$ is a solution to

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^h} \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{j} \in J, 1 \leq \rho \leq R.$$

Consider a small disturbance $\overline{\mathbf{a}} + p^l\overline{\mathbf{x}}$ of $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$, then an application of Taylor's theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}} + p^l\overline{\mathbf{x}}) &= \Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{a}_{j_1} + p^l\mathbf{x}_{j_1}, \mathbf{a}_{j_2} + p^l\mathbf{x}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_d} + p^l\mathbf{x}_{j_d}) \\ &= \Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) + p^l B_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) \cdot \overline{\mathbf{x}} + R_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})(p^l\overline{\mathbf{x}}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $R_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})(\overline{\mathbf{x}})$ is a polynomial in $\overline{\mathbf{x}}$ all of whose terms are of degree ≥ 2, and $B_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$ is defined as follows. If $\mathbf{e}_n$ is the n-th unit vector, we write

$$L_n^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(d-1)}) = \Phi^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{e}_n, \mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(d-1)}),$$

so that

$$\Phi^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d-1}) = \sum_{n=1}^{s} L_n(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d-1}) x_n.$$

Then we can define $B_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$ via the relation

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) \cdot \overline{\mathbf{x}} &= \sum_{k=1}^{d} \Phi^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_{k-1}}, \mathbf{x}_{j_k}, \mathbf{a}_{j_{k+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_d}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{d} \sum_{n=1}^{s} L_n^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_{k-1}}, \mathbf{a}_{j_{k+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_d}) x_{j_k,n} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{n=1}^{s} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{d} L_n^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_{k-1}}, \mathbf{a}_{j_{k+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_d}) \delta_{j_k,i} \right] x_{i,n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ denotes the Kronecker delta. Letting the term in the square brackets be denoted by $B_{\mathbf{j},n,i}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$, one has the $(Rr \times ms)$-matrix

$$\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) = \left[B_{\mathbf{j},n,i}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) \right]_{\mathbf{j},\rho;n,i}$$

A solution $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ to (2.3) is therefore singular if $\operatorname{rank}(\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})) \leq Rr - 1$.

For an integer matrix A let $\operatorname{rank}_q(A)$ denote the rank of the matrix A reduced modulo q. This is clearly bounded above by $\operatorname{rank}(A)$ in the classical sense, and the number of q such that $\operatorname{rank}_q(A) \neq \operatorname{rank}(A)$ is finite. If the matrix A depends on a parameter $\overline{\mathbf{x}}$ we will write $\operatorname{ord}_p(A)$ for the least power h of p such that for some $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_0$ one has

$$\operatorname{rank}_{p^h}(A(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_0)) = Rr$$

if such an integer exists, and $\operatorname{ord}_p(A) = \infty$ otherwise.

Suppose the system (2.3) possesses a non-singular solution and let $\operatorname{ord}_p(\mathscr{B}) = \sigma < \infty$. Then for some $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ the matrix $\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$ has has an $(Rr \times Rr)$-minor $\mathscr{B}_0(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$ with the property

$$\left|\det \mathscr{B}_0(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\right|_p = p^{1-\sigma}; \tag{2.6}$$

we can assume without loss of generality that it is the first minor. Write $M(\sigma, \nu)$ for the number of the number of $\overline{\mathbf{a}} \in (\mathbb{Z}/p^{2\sigma-1+\nu}\mathbb{Z})^{ms}$ such that

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{2\sigma-1+\nu}} \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{j} \in J, 1 \leq \rho \leq R \tag{2.7}$$

$$\left|\det \mathscr{B}_0(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\right|_p = p^{1-\sigma}. \tag{2.8}$$

Then $M(\sigma,\nu)$ can be bounded below.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose* $ms \geq Rr$. *For any* $\nu \geq 0$ *the number of* $\overline{\mathbf{a}} \pmod{p^{2\sigma-1+\nu}}$ *subject to* (2.7) *and* (2.8) *is at least*

$$M(\sigma,\nu) \geq p^{(ms-Rr)\nu} M(\sigma,0).$$

Proof. The proof is an amalgam of the arguments of [6, Lemma 17.1] and [10, Prop. 5.20]. For $M(\sigma,0)=0$ the result is immediate, so it suffices to consider the case $M(\sigma,0)>0$. Also, the lemma is true for $\nu=0$. We can therefore proceed by induction and investigate $M(\sigma,\nu+1)$ under the assumption that for some given $\nu \geq 0$ the statement is true. Let $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ be one of the $\geq p^{(ms-Rr)\nu}M(\sigma,0)$ solutions to (2.7) and (2.8) counted by $M(\sigma,\nu)$. As in (2.5), Taylor's theorem yields

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{j}}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}+p^{\sigma+\nu}\overline{\mathbf{x}}) \equiv \Phi_{\mathbf{j}}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) + p^{\sigma+\nu}B_{\mathbf{j}}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\cdot\overline{\mathbf{x}} \pmod{p^{2\sigma+2\nu}},$$

and by (2.7) we can write $\Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) = p^{2\sigma-1+\nu}\varphi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}$ for some $\varphi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Also, by (2.8) there is a matrix $\mathscr{N} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Rr\times Rr}$ such that

$$\mathscr{N}\mathscr{B}_0(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) = \det(\mathscr{B}_0(\overline{\mathbf{a}}))\,\mathrm{Id}_{Rr} = \beta p^{\sigma-1}\,\mathrm{Id}_{Rr}$$

for some β coprime to p, so the system of congruences

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) + p^{\sigma+\nu}B_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\cdot\overline{\mathbf{x}} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{2\sigma+\nu}}, \quad \mathbf{j}\in J, 1\leq\rho\leq R$$

implies that

$$p^{2\sigma-1+\nu}\mathscr{N}\boldsymbol{\varphi} + p^{\sigma+\nu}\mathscr{N}\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\cdot\overline{\mathbf{x}} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{2\sigma+\nu}}. \tag{2.9}$$

The matrix $\mathscr{N}\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$ is of the shape

$$\mathscr{N}\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathscr{N}\big(\mathscr{B}_0(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\big|\mathscr{B}_1(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\big) = \big(\beta p^{\sigma-1}\,\mathrm{Id}_{Rr}\,\big|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{B}_1(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\big)$$

for some matrix $\mathscr{B}_1(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$, so if we restrict ourselves to counting solutions $\overline{\mathbf{x}}$ of the shape

$$x_i = \begin{cases} y_i & 1\leq i\leq Rr \\ p^{\sigma-1}y_i & Rr+1\leq i\leq ms, \end{cases}$$

we can write

$$\mathscr{N}\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\cdot\overline{\mathbf{x}} = p^{\sigma-1}\hat{\mathscr{B}}\cdot\overline{\mathbf{y}},$$

where

$$\hat{\mathscr{B}} = \big(\beta\,\mathrm{Id}_{Rr}\,\big|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{B}_1(\overline{\mathbf{a}})\big).$$

Thus the number of solutions to (2.9) is at least as big as the solution set of

$$\mathscr{N}\boldsymbol{\varphi} + \hat{\mathscr{B}}\overline{\mathbf{y}} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Since $\mathscr{N}$, $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ and $\hat{\mathscr{B}}$ are fixed, this can be considered as a non-singular system of Rr linear equations in ms variables and therefore has p^{ms-Rr} solutions. Thus altogether we have

$$M(\sigma,\nu+1) \geq p^{(ms-Rr)}M(\sigma,\nu) \geq p^{(ms-Rr)(\nu+1)}M(\sigma,0)$$

as claimed. □

3. Understanding the singularities

In order to proceed further it is crucial to control the singular cases in order to show that $M(\sigma, 0) \neq 0$. Since the matrix $\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})$ is somewhat unwieldy, we are not attempting to prove that it is indeed non-singular for any given $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$, but will rather show that under some suitable non-singularity condition on $\mathbf{F}$ these bad cases cannot occur too often. This will be accomplished by a suitable version of the inclusion-exclusion principle in the finite case and by the affine dimension theorem in the $\mathbb{Q}_p$-case.

Write $\mathscr{S}(\mathbf{a})$ for the matrix $\mathscr{S}(\mathbf{a}) = \left(\partial_n F^{(\rho)}(\mathbf{a})\right)_{n,\rho}$. In this notation we can define the reduced solution set and singular set as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X}(p^h) &= \left\{(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_m) \in [1, p^{2h+1}]^{ms} : \; \Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}) \equiv \mathbf{0} \pmod{p^{2h+1}} \text{ for all } \mathbf{j}, \rho\right\} \\ \mathfrak{S}(p^h) &= \left\{\mathbf{a} \in [1, p^{2h+1}]^s : \operatorname{rank}_{p^h}(\mathscr{S}(\mathbf{a})) \leq R - 1\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

for any given positive integer h. Notice that according to our definition of Γ_R, m in (2.4), the cardinality of $\mathfrak{X}(p^h)$ is given by $\operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{X}(p^h)) = \Gamma_{R,m}(p^{2h-1})$. Then we can ensure the existence of a non-singular solution to (2.3).

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that for some integer h one has*

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^{2h+1}) > p^{ms(2h+1)} - p^{s(2h+1)} + \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{S}(p^h)).$$

Then

$$M(l, 0) > 0.$$

for some $l \leq h+1$.

Proof. Denote the expanded singular set reduced modulo p^h by

$$\mathfrak{B}(p^h) = \left\{\overline{\mathbf{a}} \in [1, p^{2h+1}]^{ms}, \; \operatorname{rank}_{p^h}(\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})) \leq Rr - 1\right\}$$

and observe that $\mathfrak{B}(p^h)$ intersected with the diagonal

$$\mathfrak{D}(p^h) = \{\overline{\mathbf{a}} \in [1, p^{2h+1}]^{ms} : \mathbf{a}_1 = \ldots = \mathbf{a}_m\}$$

yields the singular set $\mathfrak{S}(p^h)$ defined in (3.1). Hence by the inclusion-exclusion principle we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{S}(p^h)) &= \operatorname{Card}\left(\mathfrak{B}(p^h) \cap \mathfrak{D}(p^h)\right) \\ &= \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{B}(p^h)) + \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{D}(p^h)) - \operatorname{Card}\left(\mathfrak{B}(p^h) \cup \mathfrak{D}(p^h)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since both $\mathfrak{B}(p^h)$ and $\mathfrak{D}(p^h)$ are defined over $[1, p^{2h+1}]^{ms}$, the cardinality of the union is certainly bounded by $p^{ms(2h+1)}$. Furthermore, the number of points on the diagonal is given by $\operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{D}(p^h)) = p^{s(2h+1)}$, and we have the upper bound

$$\operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{S}(p^h)) \geq \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{B}(p^h)) + p^{s(2h+1)} - p^{ms(2h+1)}.$$

This implies that when

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^{2h+1}) > p^{ms(2h+1)} - p^{s(2h+1)} + \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{S}(p^h)),$$

one has

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^{2h+1}) > \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{B}(p^h)),$$

and consequently at least one of the solutions counted by $\Gamma_{R,m}(p^{2h+1})$ has to be non-singular. If l is the least integer such that

$$\operatorname{rank}_{p^{l-1}}(\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}}_0)) = Rr,$$

then one has that $l \leq h+1$ and $M(l, 0) > 0$. □

Alternatively, we can perform the argument over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. In this setting, we have

$$\mathfrak{X} = \left\{ \overline{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{ms} : \ \Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{\rho}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{j} \in J, 1 \le \rho \le R \right\}$$

for the solution space, and the singular locus of $\mathbf{F}$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{S} = \left\{ \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{s} : \operatorname{rank}(\mathscr{S}(\mathbf{a})) \le R-1 \right\}.$$

As before, we write

$$\mathfrak{B} = \left\{ \overline{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{ms}, \ \operatorname{rank}(\mathscr{B}(\overline{\mathbf{a}})) \le Rr-1 \right\}$$

for the expanded singular locus.

Observe that again the singular locus $\mathfrak{S}$ can be recovered from $\mathfrak{B}$ by intersecting $\mathfrak{B}$ with the diagonal

$$\mathfrak{D} = \{ \overline{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{ms} : \mathbf{a}_1 = \ldots = \mathbf{a}_m \}.$$

We have $\dim(\mathfrak{D}) = s$ and the affine dimension theorem implies that

$$\dim(\mathfrak{S}) \ge \dim(\mathfrak{B}) + \dim(\mathfrak{D}) - ms,$$

whence the dimension of the singular space is bounded by

$$\dim(\mathfrak{B}) \le ms - (s - \dim(\mathfrak{S})). \tag{3.2}$$

The analogue of Lemma 3.1 over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ is the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that one has*

$$\dim \mathfrak{X} > ms - (s - \dim(\mathfrak{S})).$$

Then there exists an integer σ such that

$$M(\sigma, 0) > 0.$$

Proof. By (3.2) there are non-singular solutions if $\dim(\mathfrak{X}) > ms - (s - \dim(\mathfrak{S}))$. We can therefore conclude that under the hypotheses of the lemma the parameter σ is finite and $M(\sigma, 0) > 0$. ☐

We can now use Lemma 3.1 or 3.2, respectively, to find a non-singular solution and lift it to a p-adic solution by means of Lemma 2.1. This establishes an alternative version of Hensel's Lemma.

Theorem 3.1 (Hensel's Lemma for linear spaces)**.** *Let $F^{(1)}, \ldots, F^{(R)} \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_s]$ be forms of degree d, and m an integer. Furthermore, let $ms \ge rR$. Suppose that either for some integer h one has*

$$p^{ms(2h+1)} - \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{X}(p^h)) < p^{s(2h+1)} - \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{S}(p^h)), \tag{A}$$

or alternatively

$$\dim(\mathfrak{X}) > s(m-1) + \dim(\mathfrak{S}). \tag{B}$$

Then there exists an $l \in \mathbb{N}$ dependent only on the system $\mathbf{F}$ such that for any $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^{2l+\nu-1}) \ge p^{\nu(ms-Rr)}.$$

In particular, the variety defined by $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$ contains a non-singular p-adic linear space of dimension m.

The condition in (A) seems slightly cumbersome; it requires that the relative number of solutions be greater than the relative number of singular points, where the relations are taken in an additive sense. In particular, if $m = 1$ the condition (A) reduces to

$$\operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{X}(p^h)) > \operatorname{Card}(\mathfrak{S}(p^h)),$$

which is equivalent to demanding the existence of a non-singular solution modulo p^{2h+1}. Thus, Theorem 3.1 reproduces the classical version of Hensel's Lemma ([10, Prop. 5.21]) in this case. The alternative hypothesis is essentially the same, except for being formulated in terms of dimension instead of cardinalities. In fact, the analogy becomes obvious if one expresses condition (B) in the shape $ms-\dim(\mathfrak{X}) < s-\dim(\mathfrak{S})$.

In its present shape, our new version of Hensel's Lemma is only of limited use to us, as it is not well suited to our general state of knowledge. In fact, while there are many results available about the least number of variables required to guarantee the existence of p-adic solutions to polynomial equations, we tend to know less about the number of solutions for any given modulus or over $\mathbb{Q}_p$. It would therefore be desirable to rephrase the conditions in Theorem 3.1 in terms of existence of p-adic solutions only. This is indeed possible.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose*

$$s-\dim(\mathfrak{S}) > \gamma_d^p(R,m).$$

Then the system (2.3) *possesses a non-singular p-adic solution.*

Proof. Let $b = \dim \mathfrak{B}$. By a suitable version of Bertini's Theorem such as [15, Lemma 2.6] we can find a hyperplane $H_0 \subset \mathbb{Q}_p^{ms}$ such that the intersection $\mathfrak{X} \cap H_0$ has a singular locus of dimension

$$\dim(\mathfrak{B} \cap H_0) \leq \max\{-1, b-1\}.$$

Thus after k iterations we find a set

$$\mathfrak{H}_k = H_0 \cap \ldots \cap H_k$$

such that the expanded singular locus $\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathfrak{H}_k$ is of dimension at most $b-(k+1)$. For $k=b$ this equals -1, so we can infer that the set $\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathfrak{H}_b$ is empty and thus $\mathfrak{X} \cap \mathfrak{H}_b$ consists only of non-singular points. It suffices therefore to show that the set $\mathfrak{X} \cap \mathfrak{H}_b$ is non-empty.

Since all the H_k are hyperplanes contained in $\mathbb{Q}_p^{ms}$, the space $\mathfrak{H}_b$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}^{ms-b-1}(\mathbb{Q}_p)$, and by (3.2) its dimension is

$$\dim(\mathfrak{H}_b) = ms-b-1 \geq s-\dim \mathfrak{S}-1. \tag{3.3}$$

In order to show that $\mathfrak{X} \cap \mathfrak{H}_b$ is non-empty, it is therefore enough to show that the system $\mathbf{F}=\mathbf{0}$ contains an m-dimensional p-adic space contained in $\mathfrak{H}_b$. However, by the definition of $\gamma_d^p(R,m)$ and (3.3) this is guaranteed if

$$s-\dim \mathfrak{S}-1 \geq \gamma_d^p(R,m).$$

□

Altogether, on combining Lemma 3.3 with Theorem 3.1 we obtain the following.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $F^{(1)}, \ldots, F^{(R)} \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_s]$ be as above, and m an integer. Furthermore, suppose that $ms \geq Rr$, and that*

$$s-\dim \mathfrak{S} > \gamma_d^p(R,m).$$

Then the hypersurface $F^{(1)} = \ldots = F^{(R)} = 0$ contains a non-singular p-adic linear space of dimension m, and there exists an $l \in \mathbb{N}$ dependent only on the system $\mathbf{F}$ such that for any $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^{2l+\nu-1}) \geq p^{\nu(ms-Rr)}.$$

This implies that for any given system of equations which is not too singular the quantity $\Gamma_{R,m}(p^h)$ is of the expected order of magnitude virtually as soon as it one has a non-trivial p-adic solution. Notice also that for $m=1$ one has $r=1$ and hence Theorem 3.2 reproduces standard results such as [6, Lemma 17.1].

4. Birch's Theorem and Cubic intersections

For our proof of Theorem 1.1 we notice that by the classical arguments of Birch's Theorem as in [3] the condition $s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > H_d(m, R)$ suffices to establish a Hasse Principle. Furthermore, as per [17, §2] the real density χ_∞ is non-zero provided the degree d is odd, so the only thing that remains to show is that if $s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > \gamma_d^*(m, R)$ the p-adic densities as well will be non-zero.

In [3, eq. (35)] we showed that the constant χ_p can be expressed as

$$\chi_p = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} p^{-lms} \sum_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}=1}^{p^l} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\mathbf{u}}=1 \\ (\underline{\mathbf{u}}, p)=1}}^{p^l} e\left(\mathfrak{F}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}; p^{-l}\underline{\mathbf{u}})\right), \tag{4.1}$$

where we followed the notation from [3] in writing $\underline{\mathbf{u}} = (u_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)})_{\mathbf{j} \in J, 1 \le \rho \le R}$ and

$$\mathfrak{F}\left(\overline{\mathbf{x}}; \underline{\mathbf{u}}\right) = \sum_{\rho=1}^{R} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in J} \underline{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)} \Phi_{\mathbf{j}}^{(\rho)}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}).$$

Furthermore, it follows from [3, Lemma 12] that for $s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > H_d(R, m)$ one has

$$p^{-lms} \sum_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}=1}^{p^l} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\mathbf{u}}=1 \\ (\underline{\mathbf{u}}, p)=1}}^{p^l} e\left(\mathfrak{F}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}; p^{-l}\underline{\mathbf{u}})\right) \ll p^{-l(1+\delta)}.$$

for some $\delta > 0$. By a standard argument (see [6, Lemma 5.2 and Cor.] for instance) this implies $\chi_p = 1 + O(p^{-(1+\delta)})$ and thus

$$1/2 \le \prod_{p > p_0} \chi_p \le 3/2$$

for for some suitable p_0. It remains to show that every individual χ_p is positive.

The expression in (4.1) can be transformed by what are essentially standard operations into the following, more intuitively accessible version.

Lemma 4.1. *We have*

$$\chi_p = \lim_{i \to \infty} p^{i(Rr - ms)} \Gamma_{R,m}(p^i).$$

Proof. This is like [6, Lemma 5.3]. Notice that the vector $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ has Rr components, so by (2.4) and standard orthogonality relations one has

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^i) = p^{-iRr} \sum_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}=1}^{p^i} \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{u}}=1}^{p^i} e\left(\mathfrak{F}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}; p^{-i}\underline{\mathbf{u}})\right).$$

Furthermore, we can force a coprimality condition on the sum by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}=1}^{p^i} \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{u}}=1}^{p^i} e\left(\mathfrak{F}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}; p^{-i}\underline{\mathbf{u}})\right) &= \sum_{l \le i} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\mathbf{u}}=1 \\ (\underline{\mathbf{u}}, p)=1}}^{p^l} \sum_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}=1}^{p^i} e\left(\mathfrak{F}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}; p^{-l}\underline{\mathbf{u}})\right) \\ &= \sum_{l \le i} p^{(i-l)ms} \sum_{\substack{\underline{\mathbf{u}}=1 \\ (\underline{\mathbf{u}}, p)=1}}^{p^l} \sum_{\overline{\mathbf{x}}=1}^{p^l} e\left(\mathfrak{F}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}; p^{-l}\underline{\mathbf{u}})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two statements and taking the limit $i \to \infty$ completes the proof. □

In order to prove $\chi_p > 0$ for any prime p it therefore suffices to show that there is a constant c_p such that

$$\Gamma_{R,m}(p^i) \geq c_p p^{(ms-Rr)i}$$

for all sufficiently large i. This is immediate from Theorem 3.2, provided that the number of variables s obeys

$$s - \dim \mathfrak{S} > \gamma_d^p(R,m).$$

Replacing $\gamma_d^p(R,m)$ by $\gamma_d^*(R,m)$ therefore implies that the product over all p-adic densities is positive, which completes the proof of the theorem.

Often it is useful to express results of a shape similar to that of Theorem 1.1 in a way that avoids explicit mention of the singularities. Let therefore $h(F)$ denote the least integer h that allows a form F to be written identically as a decomposition

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = G_1(\mathbf{x})H_1(\mathbf{x}) + \cdots + G_h(\mathbf{x})H_h(\mathbf{x})$$

of forms $G_i, H_i \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ of degree strictly smaller than $\deg(F)$. For a system of forms one takes the minimum over the forms in the rational pencil of the $\left(F^{(\rho)}\right)$ and defines

$$h(\mathbf{F}) = \min_{\mathbf{c}} h\left(c^{(1)}F^{(1)} + \cdots + c^{(R)}F^{(R)}\right),$$

where $\mathbf{c}$ runs over the non-zero elements of $\mathbb{Q}^R$.

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathbf{F}$, R, and m be as in Theorem 1.1, and let d be odd. Then the number of linear spaces satisfies* (1.3)*, provided that*

$$h(\mathbf{F}) \geq (\log 2)^{-d} d! \max\{H_d(R,m), \gamma_d^*(R,m)\} + (\log 2)^{-d} d!(d-1)R(R-1),$$

and the product of the local densities $\chi_\infty \prod_p \chi_p$ is positive.

Corollary 2. *Let $F^{(1)}, \ldots, F^{(R)}$ be cubic forms such that no form in the rational pencil vanishes on a linear space Y with*

$$\operatorname{codim} Y \leq \max\{H(R,m), \gamma_3^*(R,m)\}.$$

Then the asymptotic formula from Theorem 1.1 holds true and the local densities are positive.

Proof. These correspond to Corollary 1 and Theorem 5 in [3], respectively, and the proofs are identical. □

It remains to complete the proof of the closely related Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

The key inequality we will be using is

$$\gamma_3(R,m) \leq \sum_{\rho=1}^{R} \max\{H_3(\rho,m), \gamma_3^*(\rho,m)\}, \tag{4.2}$$

the proof of which is identical to that of the respective inequality in [3, §8]. Into this we insert the bound $\gamma_3^*(R,1) \leq 5300R(3R+1)^2$ of [16, Thm 1] and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_3(R,1) &\leq \sum_{\rho=1}^{R} \max\left\{5300\rho(3\rho+1)^2, 8\rho(\rho+1)\right\} \\
&= 5300\left(9R^2(R+1)^2/4 + R(R+1)(2R+1) + R(R+1)/2\right) \\
&= 5300R(R+1)\left(9R^2/4 + 17R/4 + 3/2\right) \\
&\leq 11925R(R+1)^3.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves Theorem 1.2.

For larger m the first estimate can be derived from the treatment of the case $m = 1$. Notice that by (2.2) the R cubic forms expand into a system of rR equations in altogether ms variables, given by

$$\Phi^{(\rho)}_{j_1,j_2,j_3} = 0 \quad (1 \le \rho \le R; 1 \le j_1 \le j_2 \le j_3 \le m).$$

Thus if

$$ms \gg (Rr)^4 \asymp (Rm^3)^4,$$

the $\Phi^{(\rho)}_{\mathbf{j}}$ contain a common zero by the treatment of the case $m = 1$. In particular, since we can safely assume $m \ge 2$ and therefore $m + 2 \le (4/3)(m + 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_3(R, m) &\le m^{-1}\gamma_3(Rr, 1)\\ &\le m^{-1}((13/6)Rm(m + 1)(m + 2))^4 \le 30R^4(m + 1)^{11}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, following through the argument of [3, §8], we see that inserting the bound

$$\gamma_3^*(R, m) \le 10(6R^2 + mR)^2$$

recorded in [3, Lemma 16] into (4.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\rho=1}^{R} \gamma_3^*(\rho, m) &\le 10/3(R + 1)^3m^2 + 30(R + 1)^4m + 72(R + 1)^5\\ &\le 106 \max\{(R + 1)^3m^2, (R + 1)^5\}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, one has

$$\sum_{\rho=1}^{R} H_3(\rho, m) = \sum_{\rho=1}^{R} 24\rho(\rho r + 1) \le 8(R + 1)^3r + 12R(R + 1),$$

where

$$r = m(m + 1)(m + 2)/6 \le (m + 1)^3/6.$$

Combining these estimates one sees that

$$\gamma_3(R, m) \le 106 \max\left\{(R + 1)^5, (R + 1)^3(m + 1)^3\right\}.$$

For the sake of completeness it should be mentioned that the methods used do not yield honest linear spaces unless we can ensure that the span of the vectors is of the right dimension. Let $s > \gamma_3(R, m)$ for some m and suppose for convenience here that m is even. Then we can find distinct vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m$ contained in the intersection of the R hyperplanes, and following the proof of Theorem 3 in [14] one shows that the vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m$ are at least of rank $m/2$, provided that $s > 2Rrd/m + m/2$. This requirement is, however, easily met by any s obeying the statements, and one has a proper m-dimensional space as soon as $s > \gamma_3(R, 2m)$.

Note that under further assumptions there are better bounds on $\gamma_d^*(R, 1)$ available. The rather large constant can be improved significantly for all odd primes [9, Theorem 1], so if 2-adic solubility is granted, one does much better. On the other hand, Leep and Schmidt [13, p.546] and Wooley [20, Lemma 3.1] were able to bound the quantity $\gamma_d^*(R, 1)$ by quartic polynomials in R that have much smaller coefficients and thus prevail for small R. Obviously, these improvements carry over into our situation.

References

[1] Birch, B. J.: *Homogeneous forms of odd degree in a large number of variables.* Mathematika **4** (1957), 102–105.

[2] Birch, B. J.: *Forms in many variables.* Proc. Roy. Soc. Ser. A **265** (1961/1962), 245–263.

[3] Brandes, J.: *Forms representing forms and linear spaces on hypersurfaces.* submitted. Preprint available under arXiv:1202.5026.

[4] Brauer, R.: *A note on systems of homogeneous algebraic equations.* Bull. American Math. Soc. (2), **51** (1945), 749–755.

[5] Davenport, H.: *Cubic forms in thirty-two variables.* Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. Ser. A **251** (1959), 193–232.

[6] Davenport, H.: *Analytic Methods for Diophantine Equations and Diophantine Inequalities.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.

[7] Davenport, H., Lewis, D. J.: *Homogeneous additive equations.* Proc. Royal Soc. Ser. A **274** (1963), 443–460.

[8] Dietmann, R., Wooley, T. D.: *Pairs of cubic forms in many variables.* Acta Arith. **110** (2003), no.2, 125–140.

[9] Dietmann, R.: *Systems of cubic forms.* J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **77** (2008), no. 3, 666–686.

[10] Greenberg, M. J.: *Lectures on forms in many variables.* W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam 1969.

[11] Hartshorne, R.: *Algebraic Geometry.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics **52**. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.

[12] Heath-Brown, D. R.: *Cubic forms in fourteen variables.* Invent. Math. **170** (2007), 199–230.

[13] Leep, D. B., Schmidt, W. M.: *Systems of homogeneous equations.* Invent. Math. **71** (1983), no. 3, 539–549.

[14] Lewis, D. J., Schulze-Pillot, R.: *Linear Spaces on the intersection of cubic hypersurfaces.* Monatsh. Math. **97** (1984), 277-285.

[15] Marmon, O.: *The density of integral points on complete intersections.* Quart. J. Math. **59** (2008), 29–53.

[16] Schmidt, W. M.: *On Cubic Polynomials. III. Systems of p-adic equations.* Monatsh. Math. **93** (1982), no.3, 211-223.

[17] Schmidt, W. M.: *On Cubic Polynomials. IV. Systems of rational equations.* Monatsh. Math. **93** (1982), no.3, 329–348.

[18] Schmidt, W. M.: *The density of integer points on homogeneous varieties.* Acta Math. **154** (1985), no.4, 234–296.

[19] Wooley, T. D.: *An explicit version of Birch's Theorem.* Acta Arith. **85** (1998), no.1, 79–96.

[20] Wooley, T. D.: *On the local solubility of diophantine systems.* Compositio Math. **111** (1998), 149–165.

School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, University Walk, Clifton, Bristol BS8 1TW, United Kingdom

E-mail address: `mazjb@bristol.ac.uk`